



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

Wood, Joanne M., Chaparro, Alex, Carberry, Trent P., & Chu, Byoung Sun (2010) Effect of simulated visual impairment on nighttime driving performance. *Optometry & Vision Science*, 87(6), pp. 379-386.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/39470/>

© American Academy of Optometry

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/OPX.0b013e3181d95b0d>

Title page

Effect of simulated visual impairment on night-time driving performance

Authors: Joanne Wood,¹ PhD, FAAO, Alex Chaparro,² PhD, Trent Carberry, BPsych¹
Byoung Sun Chu¹ MOptom, FIACLE

¹School of Optometry and Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation, Queensland
University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

²Department of Psychology, Wichita State University, Kansas, US

Number of Figures: 5

Number of Tables: 0

Corresponding author and address for reprints:

Prof Joanne M Wood, PhD, School of Optometry, QUT, Kelvin Grove, Brisbane Q
4059, Australia

1 Email: j.wood@qut.edu.au

Date of submission: October 27th 2009

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study investigated the effects of simulated visual impairment on night-time driving performance and pedestrian recognition under real road conditions.

Methods: Closed road night-time driving performance was measured for 20 young visually normal participants ($M=27.5 \pm 6.1$ yrs) under three visual conditions: normal vision, simulated cataracts and refractive blur that were incorporated in modified goggles. The visual acuity levels for the cataract and blur conditions were matched for each participant. Driving measures included sign recognition, avoidance of low contrast road hazards, time to complete the course and lane keeping. Pedestrian recognition was measured for pedestrians wearing either black clothing or black clothing with retroreflective markings on the moveable joints to create the perception of biological motion (“biomotion”). **Results:** Simulated visual impairment significantly reduced participants’ ability to recognise road signs, avoid road hazards and increased the time taken to complete the driving course ($p<0.05$); the effect was greatest for the cataract condition, even though the cataract and blur conditions were matched for visual acuity. While visual impairment also significantly reduced the ability to recognise the pedestrian wearing black clothing, the pedestrian wearing “biomotion” was seen 80% of the time. **Conclusions:** Driving performance under night-time conditions was significantly degraded by modest visual impairment; these effects were greatest for the cataract condition. Pedestrian recognition was greatly enhanced by marking limb-joints in the pattern of “biomotion” which was relatively robust to the effects of visual impairment.

Keywords: night driving, driving performance, simulated visual impairment, pedestrian recognition

BACKGROUND

Crash data provides evidence that driving at night can be more dangerous than driving during daytime hours. When adjusted for distance driven, the fatality rate at night is two to four times higher than that for daytime,¹ and the effects are even more pronounced for fatal crashes involving pedestrians, where the night-time pedestrian fatality rates are up to seven times higher than those in the daytime.² Analyses of crash databases indicate that reduced lighting and poor visibility are associated with these relatively high fatal crash rates, rather than other factors that vary between day and night-time, such as driver fatigue and alcohol consumption.^{3, 4}

The potential contribution of vision to the higher night-time crash risk is supported by studies of self-reported night-time driving difficulty and driving cessation. Older drivers commonly report difficulties with visibility at night-time, and some report that they are reluctant to drive at night.⁵⁻⁸ In large cohort studies of older adults, self-restriction of night-time driving was significantly associated with reductions in contrast sensitivity (CS) in men and low contrast visual acuity (VA) in glare in women.⁹ Similarly, those with a reduction in CS and visual fields were shown to have a higher likelihood of night-time driving cessation.¹⁰ Older adults with age-related maculopathy, glaucoma or cataracts have also reported difficulties with night driving.¹¹⁻¹⁴ In age-related maculopathy these difficulties were associated with measures of scotopic sensitivity,¹¹ while in glaucoma those with greater visual field loss reported greater difficulty with night-time driving.¹⁴

There have, however, been few objective assessments of the impact of visual impairment or age on night-time driving performance. Low-fidelity simulator studies

have indicated that steering ability was disrupted by severe and sudden reductions in visual field extent but not by reductions in luminance and increased optical blur.^{15, 16} However, the older participants in one of these studies did show a decline in steering accuracy under low luminance conditions relative to the younger participants.¹⁵ In a more recent study, wavefront guided LASIK was purported to improve night-time driving performance assessed on a driving simulator compared to conventional LASIK.¹⁷ However, the night-time driving simulator task only required participants to detect and identify projected night-time driving scenes, which even with the addition of a glare source does not replicate the environmental lighting conditions nor the complexity of night-time driving.

A recent study conducted under real-world driving conditions indicated that reduced luminance impaired the driving recognition ability of both young and older participants and these impairments in performance were better predicted by CS and low luminance VA than high contrast VA.¹⁸ This study also provided real-world evidence that night-time pedestrian recognition could be increased by the use of retroreflective materials placed on the moveable joints to create the perception of biological motion¹⁹ (“biomotion”) even for older drivers, and this is in accord with other studies of night-time pedestrian visibility.²⁰⁻²⁴ Importantly, the participants in all of these studies had normal vision, so it is unclear whether clothing incorporating “biomotion” is effective in the presence of commonly occurring visual impairments, including optical blur and cataracts.

The present study investigated how simulated cataracts and optical blur affect driving performance under real-world night-time driving conditions. A secondary aim was to

determine whether “biomotion” clothing is beneficial in enhancing pedestrian visibility even in the presence of modest amounts of visual impairment.

METHODS

Participants

Twenty young participants (mean age 27.5 ± 6.1 years; range 18-36 years; 7 F, 13M) were recruited through graduate students, research personnel and their friends in the School of Optometry. None of the participants were familiar with the hypotheses under investigation. All participants were licensed drivers, reported that they drove regularly, passed the minimum drivers' licensing criteria for binocular VA of 6/12 (20/40), were free of ocular pathology and in good general health.

A short confidential questionnaire was administered to obtain a general sense of the participants' driving experiences and habits. Only findings relevant to describing the general driving characteristics of the participants are reported here.

The study was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Queensland University of Technology Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants were given a full explanation of the experimental procedures and written informed consent was obtained, with the option to withdraw from the study at any time.

Visual Conditions

Driving performance was assessed under three visual conditions: normal best corrected VA and two visual impairment conditions, one replicating the effects of modest cataracts and the other using spherical plus lenses to create blurred vision. For

all conditions, participants drove while wearing the goggles incorporating their normal distance correction using standard wide aperture trial lenses, which provided a field of view equivalent to that of standard 38 mm trial lenses which did not restrict the binocular field of view below that of driver licensing standards in Australia of a horizontal extent of 120°. The group mean normal corrected VA was -0.14 ± 0.11 logMAR. The cataract goggles have been described previously^{25, 26} and were used to simulate the increased glare and reduction in CS of cataracts, and reduced distance VA to a mean level of 0.22 ± 0.08 logMAR (~20/32). Binocular plus lenses were used to reduce the distance VA of each participant individually to that of the cataract goggles. The mean blurring lens required to reduce VA to that of the simulated cataract was $+1.33 \text{ D} \pm 0.29 \text{ D}$.

Visual acuity and CS were measured binocularly for each visual condition. Distance high contrast VA was assessed using a logMAR Bailey Lovie Chart, at a viewing distance of 3.0 meters, with a chart luminance of 160 cd/m^2 , and scored on a letter by letter basis. Pelli-Robson Letter CS (Letter CS) was measured at a working distance of 1.0 meters, with a chart luminance of 170 cd/m^2 , using a working distance lens of $+0.75 \text{ DS}$. Participants were instructed to look at a line of letters and guess the letter when they were not sure; each letter reported correctly was scored as 0.05 log units.

Driving Assessment

The experiment was conducted under night-time conditions on the closed road circuit at the Mount Cotton Driver Training Centre, which has been used in previous studies of driving and vision^{18, 25-28} and is represented schematically in Figure 1. The experiment was only undertaken on nights when it was not raining and the road

surface was dry. The circuit, which is representative of a rural road, consists of a two to three lane bitumen road surface and includes hills, curves, intersections and straight sections as well as standard road signs and markings; a 4 km section of the circuit was used. The circuit does not include any street lighting. Two sets of headlamps, consisting of pairs of stationary battery-powered car headlamps mounted at a height and width that duplicated a real car, were positioned at two locations along the road circuit to simulate the glare effects of an oncoming vehicle. The headlamps were triggered when the test vehicle drove through a pair of remote sensors.

The experimental vehicle was an instrumented 1997 Nissan Maxima with automatic transmission, which had been serviced (including headlamp alignment) immediately prior to the experiment; low-beam headlamps were used for all testing conditions. Lane keeping was assessed using two video cameras, mounted at a fixed position on the vehicle roof and aimed to record the position of the front corners of the vehicle relative to the edge- and centre-lines of the road.

Each participant drove around the driving circuit four times (one practice lap and once for each of the three visual conditions), in both a clockwise and anticlockwise direction as indicated by the arrows in Figure 1, with the order of the vision conditions randomized. The purpose of the practice run was to familiarize participants with the vehicle, the circuit and the driving tasks which were conducted under normal vision conditions in the opposite direction to the recorded run, in order to minimize any familiarity effects. For all laps participants were instructed that they would be required to perform a series of tasks whilst driving at what they felt was a safe speed for the

conditions, to drive in their own lane except when avoiding road hazards and to obey all regulatory signs. Performance measures consisted of:

Road Sign Recognition: A total of 40 road signs were located along the route and contained a total of 65 pieces of information. These signs included warning signs, regulatory signs and street signs.

Road Hazard Recognition: Nine, large low contrast foam road hazards (~50 cm x 250 cm and 15 cm thickness; reflectance, ~10%) were positioned on the circuit at different positions for any given run. An experimenter changed the position of the road hazards between runs in a pre-determined order to minimise familiarity effects (there were a total of 12 potential positions (Figure 1) – those represented in solid black remained the same between laps, while those represented as black outlines were varied in position between laps). Participants were asked to report whenever they saw a road hazard and avoid it if it was safe to do so.

Time to complete the circuit: The time to complete the circuit was recorded.

Lane Keeping: Lane keeping was recorded by the two roof-mounted video cameras. The videotapes were analyzed by recording the time spent out of the lane for the left and right line markings calculated separately; lane crossings made when participants were avoiding a hazard were excluded from the lane keeping score.

Pedestrian Recognition: Two pedestrians were positioned at two different locations along the circuit. Both pedestrians walked in place facing the driver; the test vehicle was driven in the left hand lane towards the pedestrians who were positioned in the far right hand lane (see Figure 1). One pedestrian was positioned at the end of a straight section of three-lane roadway (A: Figure 1) which the drivers encountered first; the pedestrian moved away from view after the vehicle had passed. The second pedestrian was positioned at the other end of the straight section of the circuit and on the opposite

side of the three-lane roadway (B: Figure 1). This pedestrian did not take their place on the roadway until the vehicle had passed them going in the opposite direction. Each pedestrian had a two-way radio, as did the experimenter who was seated in the vehicle. All communication was conducted between laps with the experimenter outside of the vehicle, so the participant could not hear the conversation.

For each lap the pedestrians wore one of two clothing conditions, black or biomotion:

- Black: a black cotton sweatshirt (2% reflectance), a pair of black cotton sweatpants, black gloves and black shoe covers.
- Biomotion: the clothing from the black condition with the addition of white retroreflective (diamond grade) straps (2.5 cm; 1 inch) around the wrists, elbows, shoulders, waist, knees and ankles (total area = 525cm²).

The pedestrian clothing was randomized between laps, with the driver encountering one pedestrian wearing black and one wearing biomotion on each lap.

Dependent Measures

The outcome measures included road signs recognised, hazards hit, time to complete the course, number of pedestrians recognised and lane keeping. A composite Driving Recognition and Speed score was derived to capture the driving performance of the individual participants compared to the whole group as has been used in previous studies,²⁶⁻²⁸ and included sign recognition, course time and the number of hazards hit. Z scores for each of these three driving measures were determined and the mean Z score for each participant calculated to provide the composite Driving Recognition and Speed score

(data were transformed where necessary to ensure that better performance was always represented by a more positive Z score).

RESULTS

The questionnaire data demonstrated that participants had a mean of 8.7 ± 4.3 years driving experience and reported that $28.2\% \pm 10.7$ of their driving was at night. All participants reported that they felt either 'comfortable' or 'very comfortable' driving at night in good weather and all participants reported that the headlamps of oncoming traffic were only 'rarely' or 'occasionally' troublesome.

Vision Measures

The effect of simulated visual impairment on Letter CS is shown in Figure 2 and demonstrates that blur had a relatively small impact on Letter CS compared to that of cataracts. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA with visual condition as the within subjects variable indicated that Letter CS was significantly affected by visual condition ($F_{2,38}=592.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.98$); post hoc testing indicated that there were significant differences between the cataract condition and both the normal ($F_{1,19}=912.2$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.98$) and blur ($F_{1,19}=529.6$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.965$) conditions, and between the normal and blur conditions ($F_{1,19}=10.0$, $p=0.005$, partial $\eta^2=0.345$).

Driving Measures

The group mean data for the overall Driving Recognition and Speed score and component driving measures were analysed using a series of one-way repeated measures ANOVAs with visual condition as the within subjects variable. There was a

significant main effect of visual condition for the overall Driving Recognition and Speed score ($F_{2,38}=221.7$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.92$), which was significantly better when driving under normal vision conditions compared to either the blur ($F_{1,19}=58.9$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.756$) or cataract ($F_{1,19}=661.6$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.972$) conditions; driving with blurred vision was significantly better than driving with simulated cataracts ($F_{1,19}=138.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.88$) (Figure 3).

There was a significant main effect of visual condition for sign recognition ($F_{2,38}=64.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.773$) (Figure 4A). Sign recognition was significantly better when driving with normal vision compared to the blur ($F_{1,19}=46.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.711$) and cataract conditions ($F_{1,19}=181.5$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.905$) and was also significantly better when driving with blurred vision compared to the cataract condition ($F_{1,19}=12.5$, $p=0.002$, partial $\eta^2=0.98$, partial $\eta^2=0.397$).

Similarly, there was a significant main effect of visual condition for hazards hit ($F_{2,38}=99.6$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.84$) (Figure 4B). Participants hit significantly more hazards for the cataract condition compared to either the normal ($F_{1,19} = 184.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.907$) or blur ($F_{1,19}=58.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.756$) conditions and for the blurred condition compared to normal vision ($F_{1,19}=42.2$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.689$).

There was a significant main effect of visual condition for time to complete the course ($F_{2,38}=131.8$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.874$), with participants driving more slowly under the visual impairment conditions (Figure 4C). Participants drove more slowly for the cataract condition compared to both the normal ($F_{1,19}=281.9$, $p<0.001$, partial

$\eta^2=0.937$) and blurred vision conditions ($F_{1,19}=101.9$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=0.843$), and for the blurred vision condition compared to normal ($F_{1,19}=13.6$, $p=0.002$, partial $\eta^2=0.417$).

The lane-keeping data demonstrated that there was no significant effect of visual condition for either the percentage of time driven across the centre ($F_{2,38}=1.7$, $p=0.19$) or the edge ($F_{2,38}=1.8$, $p=0.18$) lane lines.

When the pedestrians were wearing black clothing they were seen 35% of the time under the normal vision condition, 5% of the time for the blurred vision condition and were never seen for the simulated cataract condition (Figure 5). Conversely, 100% of the pedestrians wearing “biomotion” clothing were seen when the participants were driving with normal vision and 80% of the time for both the blur or cataract conditions. The likelihood that a pedestrian would be recognized was modeled as a function of pedestrian clothing and driver vision condition using a generalized estimating equation model with pedestrians correctly recognized as a binomial criterion. Pedestrian clothing ($\chi^2(1)=362.8$) and the drivers’ vision condition ($\chi^2(2)=615.7$) both significantly ($p<0.001$) explained the ability to recognize pedestrians. The models were compared using an independent or autocorrelation error structure and were the same.

Relationship between vision and driving

Since the simulating goggles affected VA and CS to differing extents, it was of interest to examine whether the changes in driving performance were primarily driven by the changes in VA, CS, or both. For this analysis, a series of linear mixed effects

models were constructed with Letter CS and VA as covariates, measures of driving performance as criteria and with participant ID entered as a random variate to account for repeated observations. Variables were standardized prior to analysis to enable comparison of the regression coefficients. Coefficients of determination for each model were calculating using the procedure recommended by Xu.²⁹

The results show that the experimentally induced changes in CS and VA were strong predictors of overall Driving Recognition and Speed score ($F_{1,46.14}=77.6$, $p<0.001$, $\beta=0.59$ for CS and $F_{1,43.36}=44.7$, $p<0.001$, $\beta=-0.43$ for VA respectively, overall $R^2=0.84$), signs recognised ($F_{1,49.82}=10.5$, $p=0.002$, $\beta=-0.57$ for CS and $F_{1,44.7}=37.9$, $p<0.001$, $\beta=0.31$ for VA respectively, overall $R^2=0.65$) and road hazards hit ($F_{1,44.09}=28.9$, $p<0.001$, $\beta=-0.55$ for CS and $F_{1,40.04}=19.9$, $p<0.001$, $\beta=0.34$ for VA respectively, overall $R^2=0.66$), while only Letter CS was a significant predictor of time taken to complete the course ($F_{1,35.23}=35.1$, $p<0.001$, $\beta=0.63$ for CS, $F_{1,37.93}=3.73$, $p=0.06$, $\beta=0.16$ for VA, overall $R^2=0.59$). The regression coefficients indicate that Letter CS contributed substantially more to all of the driving scores than did VA.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study demonstrate that when driving at night under real-world driving conditions, simulated cataracts, which substantially reduce CS but have only a modest effect on VA, significantly degrade driving performance. Relatively small amounts of optical blur that were selected to reduce VA to the same levels as that of the cataract condition, also had a detrimental effect on measures of night-time driving performance, but to a lesser extent than that of the simulated cataracts.

Both of the simulated visual impairment conditions significantly reduced the number of signs recognised, with the simulated cataract condition almost halving the mean number of signs recognised, even though the majority of the signs were retroreflective. This is consistent with previous studies which have shown that the ability to read road signs at night was the most difficult activity reported by patients with cataracts,³⁰ and that night-time sign recognition was significantly reduced when VA was degraded by refractive blur to levels similar to those in our study.³¹

Similarly, the ability to detect road hazards and avoid them was significantly worse when participants were driving with visual impairment, particularly for the cataract condition where the mean number of road hazards hit was six. This finding is not unexpected given that the hazards were selected to be of low contrast and further reinforces the concept that it is contrast and not size that is important for visibility under night-time driving conditions.

All participants drove more slowly with simulated visual impairment, with participants taking 36% longer for the cataract condition but only 7% longer for the blurred vision condition relative to normal. Importantly, despite the fact that all participants drove more slowly for the visual impairment conditions, it was not sufficient to compensate for the decrease in their recognition abilities, as evidenced by the reduction in ability to detect the road signs, road hazards and pedestrians. These results are in agreement with our previous findings for day^{26, 32} and night-time driving,³³ which demonstrate that while choosing to drive more slowly is one potential compensatory action adopted by drivers with impairment (through visual problems and/or normal aging), it is rarely sufficient to offset the degradation in driving abilities.

Interestingly, lane keeping ability was not significantly affected when driving with simulated visual impairment, which is in accord with our previous findings on a closed road circuit for daytime driving conditions.^{25, 26, 32} Similarly, night-time driving simulator studies, have shown that lane keeping ability is relatively unaffected by refractive blur, even when the amounts of blur were extreme (up to amounts of 8-10D of blur).^{15, 16} Collectively these findings are consistent with the “selective degradation” theory³⁴ which suggests that “focal” visual tasks that rely on foveal vision, such as the detection and identification of hazards and signs, are degraded by optical blur and reduced illumination, while those that rely on “ambient” (i.e., peripheral) vision, including lane keeping, heading and speed, are relatively immune to the effects of optical blur and reductions in illumination.

The results of this study suggest that the purported advantages of “biomotion” for enhancing night-time pedestrian visibility reported for drivers with normal vision^{18, 20-22} are maintained even in the presence of visual impairment. This finding is supported by previous laboratory-based studies of biological motion that have demonstrated that the perception of biological motion is remarkably robust. Observers show no decrease in sensitivity to biological motion defined either by luminance, texture or random contrast polarity³⁵ or under dim lighting conditions.³⁶ Importantly, the conspicuity advantage conferred by the placement of reflective markers creating biological motion has been shown to be greater than that derived from wearing a reflective vest (that included an equal amount of reflective material to that of the biomotion condition) or a stripe of reflective material.^{18, 22, 24}

In terms of determining how well standard vision tests can predict night driving performance, our findings suggest that while both VA and CS predicted night-time driving performance (with the exception of driving time which was only significantly associated with CS), CS contributed more substantially to the driving scores than did VA. Similar findings were reported in a related night-time study,¹⁸ where CS or low luminance VA were better predictors of night-time recognition than were standard measures of VA. In a study of daytime driving,^{25, 32} some, but not all, measures of driving performance were linearly related to VA degradation produced by optical blur, however, the greatest decrement in driving performance resulted when the VA degradation resulted from simulated cataracts, as was also the case in the study reported here. Collectively these findings suggest that while VA remains the most commonly administered measure of vision for driving across the world, its ability to predict both day and night-time driving performance is not as strong as that of measures of CS. However, it is also important to recognize that day and night-time driving performance potentially involves other aspects of visual performance, including visual attention,²⁶ detection of motion,^{27, 37} peripheral vision^{38, 39} and patterns of optical flow;⁴⁰ it would be useful to incorporate these measures into future studies of vision and driving performance.

While these and other research findings clearly highlight the important relationship between reduced contrast and driving performance, what is less well understood is which specific visual cues are degraded or lost when viewing the driving environment through cataracts. Cataracts may reduce the availability of those formal and informal driving cues that are of relatively low contrast, such as weathered lane markings and signs, changes in roadway texture, potholes and real-world speed bumps which are

significant because they require the driver to take some kind of evasive action to avoid an incident. Alternatively, cataracts might also impede or slow the recognition and processing of important environmental cues^{41, 42} and have concomitant effects on higher levels of cognitive processes including the perception of risk and allocation of attentional resources.⁴³ Better understanding of how reduced contrast impacts on the acquisition and processing of driving related information is essential to the development of interventions to reduce their impact on older drivers.

The finding that simulated blur reduced many aspects of night-time driving performance could be considered relevant to the issue of night myopia, a condition observed under low illumination, where normal observers become myopic (short-sighted) in the absence of a strong visual stimulus to drive the accommodative response.⁴⁴ However, while there have been some reports of increased night-time crashes for those with night myopia,⁴⁵ the evidence is limited and as highlighted by Arumi et al.⁴⁶, night myopia only becomes significant at light levels below 0.03 cd/m², which is much lower than that normally encountered under night-time driving conditions. To fully understand the potential role of night myopia in night-time driving it would be necessary to continuously monitor the accommodative status of participants while undertaking night driving under real world conditions.

In summary our results demonstrate that modest amounts of visual impairment have the ability to reduce components of night-time driving ability, including recognition and speed and the effects are greater for simulated cataracts than refractive blur, despite the fact that the VA levels were matched between conditions. This implies that both the correction of refractive errors and extraction of cataracts have the potential to

improve night-time driving performance. Our data also support the more widespread adoption of “biomotion” clothing for pedestrians with high levels of exposure at night-time, such as road workers and emergency service personnel, given that the positive benefits for improved visibility are robust even in the presence of visual impairments that can be reasonably expected to be encountered in the driving population (including small amounts of uncorrected refractive error and cataracts).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research was funded by an Australian Research Council Discovery and Australian Research Council Linkage grant. The authors thank the vision and driving team for assistance in data collection, Dr Philippe Lacherez for aspects of statistical assistance and the Queensland Transport, Mt. Cotton Driver Training Centre.

REFERENCES

1. NHTSA. Motor Vehicle Traffic Crash Fatality Counts and Injury Estimates for 2004 Washington, D.C.; 2005 [updated 2005. Available at: <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov>. Accessed]; DOT HS 809923:1
2. Sullivan JM, Flannagan MJ. Determining the potential safety benefit of improved lighting in three pedestrian crash scenarios. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 2007;39:638-47.
3. Owens DA, Sivak M. Differentiation of visibility and alcohol as contributors to twilight road fatalities. *Human Factors* 1996;38:680-9.
4. Sullivan JM, Flannagan MJ. The role of ambient light level in fatal crashes: inferences from daylight saving time transitions. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 2002;34:487-98.
5. Molnar LJ, Eby DW. The relationship between self-regulation and driving-related abilities in older drivers: an exploratory study. *Traffic Inj Prev* 2008;9:314-9.
6. Kosnik WD, Sekuler R, Kline DW. Self-reported visual problems of older drivers. *Human Factors* 1990;32:597-608.
7. Shinar D, Schieber F. Visual requirements for safety and mobility of older drivers. *Human Factors* 1991;33:507-19.
8. Charlton JL, Oxley, J., Fildes, B., Oxley, P., Newstead, S., Koppel, S., & O'Hare, M. Characteristics of older drivers who adopt self-regulatory driving behaviours. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 2006;9:363-73.
9. Brabyn JA, Schneck ME, Lott LA, Haegerstrom-Portnoy G. Night driving self-restriction: Vision function and gender differences. *Optometry & Vision Science* 2005;82:755-64.
10. Freeman EE, Munoz B, Turano KA, West SK. Measures of visual function and their association with driving modification in older adults. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2006;47:514-20.
11. Scilley K, Jackson GR, Cideciyan AV, Maguire MG, Jacobson SG, Owsley C. Early age-related maculopathy and self-reported visual difficulty in daily life. *Ophthalmology* 2002;109:1235-42.
12. Owsley C, Stalvey, B., Wells, J. & Sloane, M.E. Older drivers and cataract: Driving habits and crash risk. *Journal of Gerontology: Medical Sciences* 1999;54A:M203-M11.
13. McGwin J, Gerald, Scilley K, Brown J, Owsley C. Impact of cataract surgery on self-reported visual difficulties: Comparison with a no-surgery reference group. *Journal of Cataract & Refractive Surgery* 2003;29:941-8.
14. Janz NK, Musch DC, Gillespie BW, Wren PA, Niziol LM. Evaluating clinical change and visual function concerns in drivers and nondrivers with glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2009;50:1718-25.
15. Owens DA, Tyrrell RA. Effects of luminance, blur, and age on nighttime visual guidance: A test of the selective degradation hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 1999;5:115-28.
16. Brooks JO, Tyrrell R, Frank TA. The effects of severe visual challenges on steering performance in visually healthy young drivers. *Optometry & Vision Science* 2005;82:689-97.

17. Schallhorn SC, Tanzer DJ, Kaupp SE, Brown M, Malady SE. Comparison of night driving performance after wavefront-guided and conventional LASIK for moderate myopia. *Ophthalmology* 2009;116:702-9.
18. Wood JM, Owens DA. Standard measures of visual acuity do not predict drivers' recognition performance under day or night conditions. *Optometry & Vision Science* 2005;82:698-705.
19. Johansson G. Visual perception of biological motion and a model for its analysis. *Perception & Psychophysics* 1973;14:201-11.
20. Blomberg RD, Hale A, Preusser DF. Experimental evaluation of alternative conspicuity-enhancement techniques for pedestrians and bicyclists. *Journal of Safety Research* 1986;17:1-12.
21. Luoma J, Schumann J, Traube EC. Effects of retroreflector positioning on nighttime recognition of pedestrians. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 1996;28:377-83.
22. Wood JM, Tyrrell RA, Carberry TP. Limitations in drivers' ability to recognize pedestrians at night. *Human Factors* 2005;47:644-53.
23. Owens DA, Antonoff, R.J. & Francis, E.L. Biological motion and nighttime pedestrian conspicuity. *Human Factors* 1994;36:718-32.
24. Tyrrell RA, Wood JM, Chaparro A, Carberry TP, Chu BS, Marszalek RP. Seeing pedestrians at night: visual clutter does not mask biological motion. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 2009;41:506-12.
25. Higgins KE, Wood JM. Predicting components of closed road driving performance from vision tests. *Optometry & Vision Science* 2005;82:647-56.
26. Wood J, Chaparro A, Hickson L. Interaction between visual status, driver age and distracters on daytime driving performance. *Vision Res* 2009;49:2225-31.
27. Wood JM. Age and visual impairment decrease driving performance as measured on a closed-road circuit. *Human Factors* 2002;44:482-94.
28. Chaparro A, Wood JM, Carberry T. Effects of age and auditory and visual dual tasks on closed-road driving performance. *Optometry & Vision Science* 2005;82:747-54.
29. Xu R. Measuring explained variation in linear mixed effects models. *Statistics in Medicine* 2003;22:3527-41.
30. Pesudovs K, Garamendi E, Keeves JP, Elliott DB. The Activities of Daily Vision Scale for cataract surgery outcomes: re-evaluating validity with Rasch analysis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2003;44:2892-9.
31. Kline DW, Buck K, Sell Y, Bolan TL, Dewar RE. Older observers' tolerance of optical blur: Age differences in the identification of defocused text signs. *Human Factors* 1999;41:356-64.
32. Higgins KE, Wood J, Tait A. Vision and driving: selective effect of optical blur on different driving tasks. *Human Factors* 1998;40:224-32.
33. Owens DA, Wood JM, Owens JM. Effects of age and illumination on night driving: A road test. *Human Factors* 2007;49:1115-31.
34. Leibowitz HW, Rodemer CS, Dichgans J. The independence of dynamic spatial orientation from luminance and refractive error. *Perception & Psychophysics* 1979;25:75-9.
35. Ahlstrom V., Blake R, Ahlstrom U. Perception of biological motion. *Perception* 1997;26:1539-48.
36. Grossman ED, Blake R. Perception of coherent motion, biological motion and form-from-motion under dim-light conditions. *Vision Research* 1999;39:3721-7.

37. Gegenfurtner KR, Mayser H, Sharpe LT. Seeing movement in the dark. *Nature* 1999;398 475-6.
38. Wood JM, Troutbeck R. The effect of restriction of the binocular visual field on driving performance. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 1992;12:291-8.
39. Owsley C, McGwin G. Vision impairment and driving. *Surv Ophthalmol* 1999;43:535-50.
40. Kandil FI, Rotter A, Lappe M. Driving is smoother and more stable when using the tangent point. *Journal of Vis* 2009;9:1-11.
41. Harley EM, Dillon AM, Loftus GR. Why is it difficult to see in the fog? How stimulus contrast affects visual perception and visual memory. *Psychon Bull Rev* 2004;11:197-231.
42. Pashler H. Evidence against late selection: stimulus quality effects in previewed displays. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 1984 10:429-48.
43. Wingfield A, Tun PA, McCoy SL. Hearing loss in older adulthood: what it is and how it interacts with cognitive performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 2005;14:144-8.
44. Leibowitz HW, Owens DA. Night myopia and the intermediate dark focus of accommodation. *Journal of the Optical Society of North America* 1975;65:1121-8.
45. Cohen Y, Zadok D, Barkana Y, Shochat Z, Ashkenazi I, Avni I, Morad Y. Relationship between night myopia and night-time motor vehicle accidents. *Acta Ophthalmol Scand* 2007;85:367-70.
46. Arumi P, Chauhan K, Charman WN. Accommodation and acuity under night-driving illumination levels. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 1997;17:291-9.

FIGURE LEGENDS

- Figure 1. Schematic map of the driving track for the assessment of night-time driving.
- Figure 2. Group mean and SE Pelli-Robson Letter CS scores as a function of visual condition.
- Figure 3. Group mean and SE for the overall Driving Recognition and Speed score as a function of visual condition.
- Figure 4. Group mean and SE for the individual driving performance measures as a function of visual condition A: Road sign recognition, B: Road hazard avoidance and C: Time to complete the driving circuit.
- Figure 5. Percentage of pedestrians recognised as a function of visual condition and pedestrian clothing




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5

